



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,099	07/14/2003	John Irving	28849/09213	5806
27530	7590	11/10/2009		
Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP IP Department 100 North Tryon Street 42nd Floor Charlotte, NC 28202-4000			EXAMINER	VIG, NAresh
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		11/10/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/619,099	Applicant(s) IRVING ET AL.
	Examiner NARESH VIG	Art Unit 3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 2-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 2-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is in reference to communication received 19 August 2009. Claims 2 – 20 are pending for examination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments and concerns are for amended claims which have been responded to in response to the pending amended claims.

Double Patenting

Claims 2 – 4 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2 – 3 and 5 of copending Application No. 10/619,097. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because instant application and the copending application both claim the same invention of defining a plurality of levels, establishing a hierarchy for the plurality of levels, and creating a user account associated with the at least one of the plurality of levels.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As currently claimed, it is not clear whether the claimed invention is directed creating of user accounts with a level of filtering of contents, or, it is directed to monitoring and filtering of contents accessed by the users based on their user account, or, it is directed to monitoring and filtering of emails accessed by users, or, something else.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker US Publication 2003/0207245 in view of Shannon US Patent 6,233,618 and an article Netopia to Bring Parental Control, Content Filtering and Family Security Services to Broadband Service Providers hereinafter known as Netopia.

Regarding claim 2, Parker teaches system and method of providing online distance learning. Parker teaches capability of data transmission in a multi-level system for a plurality of users (Staff, Professors, TA's, End Users) [Parker, Fig. 1 and disclosure associated with the Figure]. Parker does not explicitly teach filtering and monitoring of data transmission. However, Shannon teaches system and method for filtering and monitoring of data transmission [Shannon, Fig. 2 and disclosure associated with the Figure].

Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Parker by adopting teachings of Shannon to provide access control not primarily upon content, but rather, based upon the requests made by whom, at what times [Shanon, col. 4, lines 26 – 30]; apply a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results; and also, known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Parker in view of Shannon does not explicitly recite monitoring and filtering of web content by users based on their user id. However, Netopia teaches concept and capability of providing monitoring and filtering of web access based on user ID of the user (Parental Control) to enable Service Providers increase revenue and reduce costs while improving end-user satisfaction.

Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Parker in view of Shannon by adopting teachings of Netopia to

increase revenue and reduce costs while improving end-user satisfaction; apply a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results; known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability for:
filtering and monitoring of data transmission in a multi-level system for a plurality of users operatively connected to the system via a network

defining a plurality of levels on a server of the system operatively connected to the network, wherein at least one level comprises filtering and monitoring (user will always be associated with his or her respective group) [Shanon, col. 4, lines 26 – 30, Col. 7, Lines 32 – 34];

establishing at the server a hierarchy for the plurality of levels (as explained earlier, parker teaches plurality of types of users). **It is old and known to one of ordinary skill in the art that professors have higher authority than Teacher's Assistant (aka TA's) who have higher authority than end users**, and, Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify assign different level to different type of users such that the user with lower authority will have access to subset of the user with the higher authority, apply a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results; wherein the hierarchy defines levels that are above other levels and

levels that are below other levels, and therefore, is able to inherit any filtering and monitoring of levels above

creating a user account associated with the at least one of the plurality of levels, wherein the user account controls filtering and monitoring applied to other user accounts associated with levels below the at least one of the plurality of levels
(implementing group level access technology to manage system access is old and known to one of ordinary skill in the art).

Regarding claim 3, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the user account associated with the at least one of the plurality of levels is able to designate the filtering and monitoring control of the user account to at least one of the other user accounts associated with levels below the at least one of the plurality of levels **(old and known to one of ordinary skill in the art that a person/operator with administrative control is able to configure access limitations of the users who have lower authority).**

Regarding claim 4, as responded to earlier, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the at least one of the other user accounts to which the filtering and monitoring control of the user account has been delegated is able to delegate as much of the filtering and monitoring control that has been delegated to the at least one of the other user accounts to another of the other

user accounts associated with levels at or below the level associated with the at least one of the other user accounts.

Regarding claim 5, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the filtering and monitoring can be based on a total number of instances that a keyword appears in a webpage.

Regarding claim 6, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the filtering and monitoring can be based on a list of blocked webpages.

Regarding claim 7, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the filtering and monitoring can be based on a list of allowed webpages.

Regarding claim 8, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the allowed list can be generated by the user account associated with the at least one of the plurality of levels.

Regarding claim 9, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein content of the allowed list can comprise a collection of recognized

providers.

Regarding claim 10, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the filtering and monitoring can be based on a combination of a list of blocked webpages and a list of allowed webpages.

Regarding claim 11, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the filtering and monitoring can be based on a list of allowed webpages; and the at least one of the other user accounts to which the filtering and monitoring control of the user account has been delegated is able to remove specific webpages from the list

Regarding claim 12, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the filtering and monitoring can be based on a level of blocking appropriate to the other user accounts associated with levels below the at least one of the plurality of levels.

Regarding claim 13, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability the level of blocking can be based on a reading level of the other user accounts associated with levels below the at least one of the plurality of levels and based on a plurality of keywords associated with a category

Regarding claim 14, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the level of blocking can be based on a reading level of the other user accounts associated with levels below the at least one of the plurality of levels

Regarding claim 15, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the level of blocking is based on a plurality of keywords associated with a category.

Regarding claim 16, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the plurality of keywords associated with the category is determined based upon a check of webpages identified as acceptable.

Regarding claim 17, as responded to earlier, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches system and method for filtering and monitoring web browsing for content. Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability for:

identifying requirements associated with content or data about content, wherein at least one of the requirements is based on categorization of keywords so as to establish a first category of information consistent with a particular requirement of a group of users, wherein the first category is not based on appropriateness, and so as to establish a second category of information based on appropriateness;

storing data representative of the first and second categories on a server;

setting a level of filtering and monitoring based on the first and second categories
(old and known to one of ordinary skill in the art that there have been commercially known products which monitor and filter information on user web browsing interface, For example, Parental Control).

Regarding claim 18, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the first category of information can include information that is not related to the group consisting of sexual content and violence.

Regarding claim 19, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the second category of information can include information that is not related to one of the group consisting of racism and ecommerce.

Regarding claim 20, Parker in view of Shannon and Netopia teaches concept and capability wherein the first category of information can include information that is related to one of the group consisting of racism and ecommerce.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 CFR 1.111 (c) to consider the references fully when responding to this office action.

1. Safety: Monitoring Web Access

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NARESH VIG whose telephone number is (571)272-6810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 7:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

November 9, 2009

/Naresh Vig/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3629